Kennedy Shapes Up Poorly, P. 2

New Uphaus Appeal A Reminder That Dr. Linus Pauling, Too, May Go to Jail, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 32 SEPTEMBER 12, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

It's Not Just A Divergence Between Moscow and Peking

One reason for the divergence in viewpoint between the Russian and the Chinese Communists on the question of coexistence is that the former are accepted and the latter rejected by the family of nations. War may seem inevitable to the Chinese because the world looks a good deal more hostile when viewed from Peking than when viewed from Moscow. The Bolsheviks went through a long period of quarantine, but even in the days of their worst isolation there was no Roman-off on some nearby island supported in his claims to the mainland by American power and treated at the League of Nations as if he were still the Czar of all the Russias. If the Chinese are more intransigeant than the Russians, it is because they face a more intransigeant world. If we see a fierce face in Peking it is in part at least a mirror image of the fierce face our national policy has so long turned toward China. A China excluded from the United Nations by U.S. influence may understandably be less convinced than Russia of the possibility of reaching a modus vivendi with the United States. It is not different interpretation of Marxist-Leninist Holy Writ but a different set of facts which determines the difference in attitude between Moscow and Peking toward the outside world.

The Comfort of Rigidity

The State Department does not know what to do about the growing divergence between Moscow and Peking. To admit that they differ is to admit that some Communists may be more wicked than others. If some Communists are more wicked than others, then some Communists are better than others. But this verges on heresy. How can some Communists be better if all are no good? The split between Moscow and Peking is disturbing because it threatens the comfortable rigidity of our policy toward the Communist world. If this goes on, more flexible policies may become necessary, and flexible policies are risky politics at home. There are still grumblings about our support of Tito and our loans to Gomulka. These exceptions, like the poor girl's illegitimate children, can be defended as only little ones. But policy makers must blanch at the thought of trying to convince Congress we might be able to play balance-of-power politics by strengthening Peking. Our policies are so rigid we can't even play it the other way. While Khrushchov is trying to tell Mao that they can do business with Washington, our stupid U-2 gave China its best argument against such "revisionism" and official Washington looks forward to Mr. K's coming UN appearance with an almost hysterical displeasure. It is as if the State Department longed for the good old days of Joseph Stalin when all it had to do was glower.

Every time the Chinese Communists have tried a more conciliatory policy toward the United States, they have gotten a chilly response. When we sent Hammarskjold to Peking in 1955 to negotiate the release of 17 imprisoned U.S. fliers and he came back with a friendly invitation for their families to visit them, the State Department hastily refused to let them go lest this crack the ice of our relations with China. There have been divergences between Moscow and Peking before but we never had the skill to exploit them. There are Polish Communists who think we missed an opportunity in 1956 when China was encouraging the Polish and Hungarian Communists against Moscow; Radio Peking, November 1 of that year, even went so far as to attack "big nation chauvinism" in the relations between socialist states. These same Polish Communists think Mao was ready to do business with the West in 1957 when he said, contrary to Mr. Khrushchov, that there could be "contradictions" in the Communist States between the rulers and the masses and when he proclaimed the policy of "Let A Hundred Flowers Blossom" and "Let A Hundred

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Not All the Chinese Are In China

"General Li [Chih-min, in the Peking People's Daily on the 10th anniversary of the Korean War] said these modern revisionists, frightened out of their wits by the imperialist blackmail of nuclear war, exaggerated the consequences of the destructiveness of nuclear war, 'and begged imperialism for peace at any cost, in fact playing the role of helping imperialists undermine the militant spirit of the Socialist countries.'"

—The Observer (London), from Hong Kong, "New Chinese Attack on Khrushchov," June 26.

"In a talk I made recently to a small-college audience in Wisconsin, I said something about the importance of holding Berlin, whatever threats, blandishments or pressures Mr. Khrushchov might use to force us out. After I had finished, the blond girl asked a question, '. . . isn't it better to let Berlin go than to have everybody killed in the world and nothing left at all, like in On The Beach?" . . . The question disturbed me . . . the false assumption . . . that anything, including surrender to Communism, is better than nuclear war. . . . Mind you, radiation is not a pretty thing, and if nuclear war comes, it will be no picnic. It is even theoretically possible that the human race will some day achieve the ability to end its own existence forever, as in On The Beach. But that day is not here now. . . . As a rough guess, in case of a nuclear exchange between this country and the Soviet Union, the average American citizen would run about the same risk as a combat infantryman in the last war. But after all in the past a great many Americans have accepted that degree of risk where liberty was at stake."

—Saturday Evening Post editorial by Stewart Alsop, "Let's Stop Talking Nonsense About Fallout," July 23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kennedy Picks Conservative Cold Warriors to Advise Him After the Election

That Special Session Was A Preview of What Voters Can Expect

Though I've been a newspaperman for a third of a century, I can never remember having been bored, as I am with the current presidential campaign. The special session of Congress was a preview of what voters can expect. The widely hailed liberal victories in the Congressional elections two years ago turned out to mean little in terms of legislation. Now we have seen again that neither the antiseptically packaged Javits liberalism of Nixon nor the more advanced social welfare measures of the liberal Democrats can make headway against the conservative coalition that controls Congress through seniority and various parliamentary devices. Lyndon Johnson, built up as a great Congressional leader by a journalistic claque, turned out to be impotent when his task was to buck the Southern Democrats instead of acting as their go-between with the Northern liberals. Until the battle for reform of the rules—not just the filibuster—is won, all else will go down the drain. But while Senator Clark and the ADA have called for a thorough program of rules reforms, Kennedy is ducking the issue. It can be won only when and if a national leader has the nerve to use a presidential campaign to educate the public on its complexities.

Always Next Time on Civil Rights

I went to Senator Kennedy's press conference of September 1 on civil rights and came away with the impression of a nice cultivated young man indistinguishable from several thousand other Ivy Leaguers. His manifesto promising action on civil rights next time—it's alway *manaña* for the Negro—collapsed (see adjoining box) on the arithmetic. The 24 signers who joined in the promise represent little more than a third of the Democrats in the Senate. Direct action by sit-ins, not dependence on legislation, is making progress for the Negro. For the Negro, perhaps the only meaningful event in this contest between two synthetic young men would be a rise in the Republican vote in the South. However reactionary the immediate circumstances, the end of the one-party system below the Potomac would be a blessing for the Negro and for decent government generally. Once there are two parties instead of one, the Negro and the enlightened white Southerner will have some leverage.

There's something pathetic about the way in which liberal Democrats around the capital are warming themselves up for the campaign by telling each other that, after all, there are good men *around* Kennedy. Kennedy's press conference of August 30 should be a warning that once elected it may be difficult to keep him surrounded. Apparently Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles are to be his advisers until the votes are counted but after it's over he will revert to the more conventional stuffed shirts of the cold war. The men chosen by Kennedy to advise him on defense and foreign policy after the election show that his liberalism doesn't run very deep. Acheson's man, Paul Nitze, David Bruce, former Air Force Secretary Roswell Gilpatrick and James A. Perkins all belong to the crowd which advocates a stepped up arms race as a foreign policy panacea. Gilpatrick was on the pro-arms race Rockefeller Brothers defense study; Perkins on the alarmist still unpublished Gaither report. Nitze said at the press conference, in answer to a question, that they'd probably confer also with Nelson Rockefeller. The studies developed by this group, as the Republican *New York Herald-Tribune* reported complacently "probably will become the blueprint for a Kennedy defense budget and could well decide the shape of the over-all Kennedy foreign and military policy." Bruce, of the Mellon clan, is being pushed for Secretary of State.

Another glimpse of the realities is afforded by Kennedy's review in the Sept. 3 *Saturday Review of Literature* of Liddell Hart's "Deterrent or Defense? (See box below). This is a compote of cliches currently fashionable in Washington. It carefully avoids the word "disarmament" and nowhere speaks of arms reduction. Its emphasis on "arms control", the favorite formula of the Pentagon implies inspection without arms reduction.

Minority Leader of A Majority Party

Q. Senator, on page 3 of your statement, you say, 'a majority of the Republicans voted against civil rights, while we were supporting civil rights.' By 'we' you mean the undersigned, not all the Democrats?

Sen. KENNEDY: Yes, the undersigned.

Q. You have 24 [signers] here, and there are 66 Democratic Senators. Does that mean that the other 42 are opposed or are you united on it?

Sen. KENNEDY: No, but these [24] Senators all voted for the five [civil rights] measures that I mentioned in the statement.

Q. That would imply that only a minority of the Democratic Senators voted that way.

Sen. KENNEDY: It implies that those [24] Senators voted for all five of those measures.

Q. Yes, but that is still only less than half of the Democratic Senators.

Sen. KENNEDY: I think you can count and I can count.

Q. Yes, that is right. But how can it be the Democratic program, then, if only 24 out of 66 are for it.

Sen. KENNEDY: The program that I am announcing is my view and the view of these Senators.

—Press conference, Sept. 1, after reading statement signed by 24 Democratic Senators pledging action on a civil rights bill early next session.

So the Arms Race Goes On Until We Find the Ultimate "Invulnerable" Weapon?

"Our partners may wish to create a NATO deterrent, supplementary to our own, under a NATO nuclear treaty. Unless the Russians agree very soon to an effective arms control system, with adequate inspection provisions, nuclear knowledge and weapons will spread. This inevitable trend must be effectively and responsibly organized. . . .

"There are no easy paths out of the arms race. . . . On the other hand we must try. The design of an arms control system is as complex a task as the design of a military system. It must be approached with all the professional skills we can command: technological, military and diplomatic. . . . It will come about because we have carefully designed new forms of controlled military systems and methods of mutual inspection. . . .

"They [the Russians] are not going to take arms control negotiations seriously unless they are convinced that we shall soon have an invulnerable, mobile deterrent."

—Kennedy in Saturday Review of Literature, Sept. 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Public Opinion and the Scientific Community Must Be Aroused Against Dodd

New Uphaus Appeal A Reminder That Pauling, Too, May Go to Jail

Dr. Linus Pauling must appear before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee Sept. 15. A new appeal filed by Dr. Willard Uphaus in the U.S. Supreme Court may serve as a reminder that Dr. Pauling, too, may go to jail. Like Dr. Pauling, Dr. Uphaus denied under oath that he was a Communist but declined to supply names demanded by his inquisitors; Dr. Uphaus, the names of 600 persons who attended his World Fellowship summer camp; Dr. Pauling, the names of those who helped circulate his famous nuclear test petition to the United Nations. Dr. Uphaus's conviction for contempt was upheld 5-to-4 and only three Justices, Warren, Black and Douglas, voted last week to grant him bail. In the meantime Dr. Uphaus has been in jail since last December 14. Unless public opinion is aroused, Dr. Pauling may also go to jail.

The Strategy of Intimidation

The new brief filed on Dr. Uphaus's behalf in the Supreme Court (bearing among others the distinguished name of Mr. Grenville Clark) argues the Pauling case in advance. "Unless some constitutional barrier is erected to protect the right of associational privacy in this circumscribed but important area," the brief argues, after discussing Dr. Pauling, "quite a number of our most conscientious and distinguished citizens may soon be in jail—or (and this could be still more dangerous from the public viewpoint) may withdraw from the area of public affairs where their talents are so sorely needed."

As the Senator Was Saying We Mustn't Get Hysterical

"No single subject in our time has been so befuddled by propaganda, wishful thinking and international hysteria as the banning of nuclear tests. Before it is too late, we must call off the ban. At stake is . . . the survival of our nation. . . . Some American experts are convinced that the Soviets are already testing secretly. . . . Only by the immediate resumption of underground testing can we have any hope of preserving peace and our freedom."

—Senator Thomas E. Dodd (D. Conn) in Reader's Digest for September.

This is, indeed, the strategy of intimidation pursued by Senator Dodd and those now campaigning for a resumption of nuclear testing.

We reprint below protests which have been pouring in to Dr. Pauling and the Senate committee in the hope of encouraging other scientists to add their voices. And again we appeal for a campaign to arouse Connecticut against its Senator Dodd.

The forces which want resumption of the nuclear arms race are using Dodd as a Senatorial sounding board for their views and as a means of frightening into silence scientists who oppose them. Dodd, as vice chairman of Internal Security, an ex-FBI man with all the built-in preconceptions that implies, is their tool. He should be the focus of counter attack.

Protests from Lord Russell, Two German Nobel Laureate Physicists and Others

"I am horrified by the action of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate. It seems to me that they demanded of you what almost any honourable man would feel to be a dishonourable action. I earnestly hope that they will repent before going to extremes. Max Born has sent me a copy of his letter to you of August 10, and I wish to associate myself whole-heartedly with everything said in that letter." *Bertrand Russell*

"I wish to tell you that I am infuriated by the news of your being subpoenaed to appear before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate to reveal the names of the scientists who helped you to collect signatures for your petition to the UN about nuclear tests. You are completely right to refuse this, as the demand of the Subcommittee can mean nothing but persecution of men because of their political conviction. I share this conviction but my indignation about the procedure is mainly due to the desperation where to look for freedom and civil rights, if a committee of the U.S. Senate uses medieval political methods like the Nazis and the Soviets in Stalin's period. Do they think they can, by persecution of a few individuals, change the fact that more than 11,000 scientists have agreed to your petition? I admire your determination to put human ideals above all other considerations, and I believe that in the end this is a better kind of patriotism than mute obedience. I beg you to use this letter in any way you please." *Max Born*
(Nobel Laureate Physicist)

"I feel deeply indignant and I beg you to state that I fully agree with your aims and greatly admire your attitude." *Erwin Schroedinger*
(Nobel Laureate Physicist)

"We the undersigned, as members of the academic community, protest and oppose the current harassment of Dr. Linus Pauling by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. . . . We are convinced that an indictment of Prof. Pauling by the U.S. Senate would be a tremendous blow to American prestige."

Sent to the subcommittee signed by 178 staff members of the University of Pennsylvania and also by 107 scientists from 35 different academic and medical institutions working at Woods Hole, Mass.

"We, the undersigned members of the faculty of the State University of New York College of Medicine, Syracuse, N.Y., strongly urge the members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee not to consider contempt proceedings against Prof. Linus Pauling. . . . We respect his freedom of conscience in not wishing to name others who may have aided him in making known his views. . . ."

Dr. L. I. Gardner, H. A. Feldman, A. J. Schneider, A. E. Farah, J. B. Richmond, P. F. Wegrle and E. L. Lipton.

Telegram to Senator Eastland:

"This is to urge you to reconsider your order to Prof. Pauling to reveal the names of those who helped him circulate his petition. In my own case Prof. Pauling personally solicited my signature to it. Although a colleague of his, I emphasize that I did not sign the petition because at the time I felt it might not be an effective way to promote world peace. I am convinced there was no well organized effort to circulate his petition. Had there been such an effort, I am sure many more scientists in this country would have signed it.

"Prof. Pauling has made some of the greatest discoveries of this century, discoveries likely to be of enormous benefit to mankind. . . . It is a great tribute to this productive scientist that he has also found time to devote to the cause of world peace. . . . Nor do I see how his petition involves a threat to internal security of our country. . . ."

Prof. Edward B. Lewis

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Easy to Find in Washington Counterparts of Peking's Worst Firebrands

Chou's Call For A Nuclear-Free Pacific Dismissed As "Meaningless"

(*Continued from Page One*)

Schools of Thought Contend." In those days Peking was more "revisionist" than Moscow.

An Opportunity Lost

As recently as the Swiss Embassy reception in Peking last August 1, Chou En-lai proposed that "the countries in Asia and around the Pacific, including the United States, conclude a peace pact of mutual non-aggression and turn the whole of this area into a nuclear free area." This was at once dismissed by the State Department as "a meaningless propaganda gesture" (*New York Times,* Aug. 2). If this was merely a propagandistic maneuver, it called for an equally clever propagandistic reply of our own; it was no offhand remark. It was —as our monitoring services noted—broadcast in English to Europe and Asia; carried in Chinese over Peking's home service; and also broadcast in Japanese, Vietnamese, Thai, Korean, Laotian, Hindi and Burmese, and in English to the Philippines. Dismissing this as propaganda hardly answered it; to call it "meaningless" was itself meaningless. Our brushoff was a poor response. The diplomatic correspondent of *The Times* in London (Aug. 2) noted that Chou's proposal echoed one which Khrushchov had made 18 months earlier to the 21st Communist Party Congress in Moscow, a proposal to which the Chinese had given no response. A Pacific free of nuclear weapons would seem to imply their renunciation by Communist China. Surely this was worth exploration.

The truth is that official Washington shies away from anything which threatens to restrict the use of nuclear weapons. Those Generals like Li Chih-min (see box page one) who think the dangers of nuclear war exaggerated, those Chinese Communists who think there will be enough Chinese left to rebuild after a nuclear war is over, have their counterparts in Washington. There is a constant campaign here to downgrade the dangers of nuclear war. The Air Force and its Rand Corporation through such propagandists as Herman Kahn have been privately indoctrinating groups of leading citizens around the country along the same lines as the worst Chinese Communists. Mr. Kahn explains, as they do, that we mustn't be afraid of nuclear war, that enough Americans will be left to rebuild the country when it's over. Country A—our cities —may be destroyed but Country B—our rural areas—can survive, if protected against fallout; these are also the premises of the Rockefeller campaign for shelters. The Kahn briefings even have their little jokes. "It is possible, isn't it" Mr. Kahn asks archly, when discussing the genetic dangers, "that parents will learn to love two-headed children twice as much?" It is not just the Communist bloc, it is also our own country, it is all of humanity, that is now divided into two parties, one which believes co-existence not only possible but necessary, the other which is content to drift as if hypnotized by mutual hatred into the destruction of the human race, with all the wonders and beauties it has created.

Why We Need A Good Durable Man for Vice President

"In another five years, with a little effort by the experts in mass destruction, the U.S. and the Soviet Union will be able to destroy each other utterly with, say, 25 'begaton' explosions over America and a few more over Russia. Or just one earth-rocking 'gigaton' bang could be set off in the sea near the Soviet coast to kill most of the people in European Russia. . . . Doomsday weapons, as the Pentagon people call them . . . would be cheaper than an arsenal of land, sea and air-based missiles . . . doomsday weapons should be able to deter more for less, the argument goes.

"Military men see another saving potential in doomsday weapons—to their regret. They would make most of the Air Force and a good part of the Navy unnecessary. Civilian scientists in the AEC could build a handful of begaton weapons. Scientists in the NASA are building the Nova which could shoot the doomsday satellites into orbit. And the President or his survivor could push the button."

—News story, Washington Star, Sept. 4.

IFS to Speak on Cuba 8 p.m. Sept. 14 at Friends Meeting House, 2111 Florida Ave. N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

9/12/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED